

Sent: 23 August 2011 14:36

To: Development Plans

Subject: SOUTH LAKE LAND ALLOCATIONS - FURTHER CONSULTATION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Completed

Please find copied below my responses to be above consultations.

You have recommended that I respond in this way because I have now filled up your on-line form 'on line' 3 times -- and have had all 3 of them lost / swallowed by the system. I have reported this to you in the hope that your e-mail response system is not completely faulty. When I had pressed either the "send in response", and then the "save" and send later buttons I was immediately logged out. And when I phoned up, I was told my comments had neither been registered nor stored. Consequently, it was suggested that I send in my comments as I am doing now and you would be able to register them in your system for me. Please confirm that you have been able so to do, or notify me to struggle again!

Consequently, I hereby register my response to:

MN34 (Hash)\* (extension to R97M) west of Helme Lodge.

(\* I have no hash sign)

Object:

My objection is based on "responsible stewardship". The area proposed is situated around a grade

2 listed Georgian house and comprises extremely beautiful farm and parkland. To build thereon

is to lose forever an area of natural beauty. So I specifically oppose the development (as I do for R97M) because it would:

1) destroy an area of natural beauty.

2) diminish the bucolic impact of entry to Kendal along the proposed and Lancaster to Kendal

canal, so lessening of the attraction of using the canal if you are travelling along into "an urban sprawl."

3) endanger or killing many 200-year-old beech and oak trees which should be conserved and

replaced in that area rather than lost through root damage or felling.

4) restrict from the canal the attraction of seeing the grade 2 listed house called Helme Lodge.

5) create access mayhem from Natland Road as any entrance there would interfere with the

proposed canal basin/marina and turning circle which, we understand, can only be located in that area.

6) increase traffic, even on top of the traffic increases resulting from building a marina in the area.

7) destroy Natland Mill Beck Lane, if access is planned from there. This could already be destroyed by other proposed developments in this area. However, to do so would be to destroy one of the only Lakeland lanes left in this environ. It would require pavements on both sides and changing into two-way traffic a winding single track lane off an already busy (Asda) round about. This would destroy amenities for walkers, cyclists, joggers, and those wishing to raise the spirits!

In summary, this proposal would betray our heritage. It would be "poor stewardship" and we totally oppose.

E31(Hash) and E31M (Hash). (A proposed football and leisure area).  
Oppose

Whilst I approve in principle of the development of such activities, I understand this site is adjacent to an already proposed development to the canal system; namely, a turning circle and Marina. When built, these two will both take up considerable space and increase cars and congestion. I therefore have to oppose the football/leisure centre plans on the basis that:

- 1) access along Natland Road for matches and special events would create further traffic mayhem.
- 2) it would necessitate the extensive widening of an already busy roads (Natland Road) with houses on both sides at the entrance end.
- 3) traffic problems would further be aggravated by the lorries turning/reversing and activity at the Clarkes depot there.
- 4) it would eat into what is obviously desirable greenbelt, close to an area of historic interest (a Roman fort) and natural beauty leading to the banks of the River Kent. Therefore a loss of local countryside and corresponding amenity.

M40 (Hash) R140 (Hash): areas along with the south west of the A 65 from the Asda roundabout towards the Western Hospital.

Oppose:

I oppose these two developments in essence because they are areas of natural beauty, farmland on steeply rising hills, prominently viewed from both directions of the A65 approach road into Kendal. So, specifically, I object because, to build thereon would:

- 1) destroy the natural beauty of the exit from Kendal when travelling towards the Asda roundabout, any buildings being particularly obvious on this steeply rising hillside, now beautifully green and used for grazing cows.
- 2) destroy the entrance to Kendal when travelling the whole straight mile down the hill, passing a

hospital on the right. This affords an amazing view of both Kendal and the Lake District (Kentmere). To build upon those rolling hills on the left of the A65 would be vandalism and clear destruction of amenities!

3) any access along that stretch of the A65 would be dangerous. The Asda roundabout is already congested often with tailbacks of cars trying to enter these superstores, Asda and B&Q. So drivers speed up after they have exited that roundabout. Whilst a constant stream of traffic coming the other way would pose new hazards to negotiate with any entrances to those fields coming down to the roundabout.

4) if the access was to be at Mill Beck Lane, the private drive and lodge there is already active with some 34 properties using it at Helme Lodge itself and a further 20 or so from the houses along the lane too.

5) endanger the trees in, and surrounding ,that area. These often 200-year-old trees provide 'lungs' for Kendal and should be conserved and replaced rather than destroyed and built over.

6) Finally, viewed from the top of the local beauty spots (The Helm and surrounding hills), building on those sites would be an eyesore, however beautifully done.

In summary, such development would be a betrayal forever of our duty to preserve the best and most beautiful in our heritage, in favour of a short-term housing gain.

And in response the further 2 questions you canvas:

Please indicate whether you support, support in part or oppose a reduction in the time span of the Land Allocations document

( )Support

(X)Support in part

( )Oppose

( )No view

Support in part.

Whilst I can understand the question of "planning blight", and therefore the attraction of finishing such development by 2020, it is also important to ensure the right development. Better to do it right, than do it in a rush.

Small Villages, Hamlets & Open Countryside

Do you think the future housing and employment land needs of small villages, hamlets and open countryside is best met by: -

A. Allocating sites for houses and employment in the Land Allocations document; or

B. Communities and/or developers bringing forward sites for housing and employment for consideration under relevant Core Strategy policies, through neighbourhood plans and/or other local initiatives.

Preferred option B.

As I understand it, option A is effectively the current, top-down, overview approach of planning which allows the local district authority to see everything as a whole. This obviously has many virtues, and some form of overall strategic plan such as designating green belts and targeting brown sites or areas for natural development should be identified.

However it can also ride roughshod over local needs and knowledge. Consequently I think option B. allows for local residents to be clear as to what and where can be built on, thus limiting planning blight and preserving the best of their natural environments -- especially if greenbelt areas or the outer bands for building are specified.

I hope you can accept the above as my official comments and can submit them under my name. Philip Campbell by even putting them onto my response page for me, so that I can check on-line that they have been received and have been slotted into your system -- which I so lamentably failed to do.  
Yours Philip Campbell

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---